



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,205	01/23/2004	Atul Mukker	03-2586	8069

7590 01/24/2007
Pete Scott, Senior Corporate Counsel
LSI Logic Corporation
Legal Department - IP
1621 Barber Lane, MS D-106
Milpitas, CA 95035

EXAMINER	
ALI, MOHAMMAD	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<i>Supplements!</i> Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/764,205	MUKKER, ATUL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mohammad Ali	2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 and 12-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 12-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on 9/22/06.

The application has been examined and claims 1-8 and 12-22 are pending in this office action.

The applicants' and Examiner agreed on that the office has been sent out on December 12, 06 should have been a Non-final. Please treat this office action as a non-final.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 and 12-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

4. Claims 1-3, 7-8, 12-14 and 16-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USP, 5,778,387, Wilkerson et al. ('WILKERSON' hereinafter).

With respect to claim 1,

WILKERSON teaches method in a data-processing system for recovering data (see Fig. 3, WILKERSON), comprising:

identifying desired data from a command line interface displayable (Fig. 55, Wilkerson) within a display area of a data-processing system (see col. 11, lines 34-41, Wilkerson);

automatically saving said desired data in a memory location of said data-processing system, in response to identifying said desired data from said command line interface (see col. 12, lines 16-24, Figs. 3-8 Wilkerson); and

automatically recovering said data from said memory location of said data-processing system for display within said command line interface, if said desired data is inadvertently deleted from a command line of said command line interface (see col. 19, lines 50-56, Fig. 32, Claim 1, Wilkerson).

As to claim 2,

WILKERSON teaches the step of displaying said data within said command line interface, in response to automatically recovering said data from said memory location of said data-processing system (see col. 12, lines 16-24, Figs. 3-8 Wilkerson).

As to claim 3,

WILKERSON teaches the step of utilizing said command line interface to interact with an operating system associated with said data-processing system (see col. 12, lines 16-24, Figs. 3-8 Wilkerson).

As to claim 7,

WILKERSON teaches the steps of: permitting a user to specify a plurality of rules for recycling said data; recycling said data, in response to user input (see col. 24, lines 30-40, Fig. 45 Wilkerson).

As to claim 8,

WILKERSON teaches the step of prompting said user to specify said plurality of rules for recycling said data through a display of a graphical user interface dialog (see col. 19, lines 10-25, Wilkerson).

Claims 12-14 and 16-22 have the same subject matter as of claims 1-3 and 7-8 and essentially rejected for the same reasons as discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4-6, and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP, 5,778,387, Wilkerson et al. ('WILKERSON' hereinafter) as applied to above claims in view of USPGPUB 2005/0075748, Gartland et al. ('Gartland' herinafter).

As to claim 4,

WILKERSON teaches wherein said operating system comprises a Linux-based operating system (see col. 11, lines 34-41, Wilkerson).

WILKERSON does not explicitly indicate claimed linux based operating system.

Gartland discloses claimed linux based operating system (see para. 0050, Gartland).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because claimed linux based operating system of Gartland's teaching would have allowed WILKERSON's system for overall ISR system to arrange automatically handle a plurality of different reported error conditions and other issues that are recognized as having possible automatic resolutions or recoveries as suggested by see para 00021, Gartland.

As to claim 5,

WILKERSON teaches wherein said operating system comprises a Unix-based operating system (see col. 12, lines 16-24, Figs. 3-8 Wilkerson).

WILKERSON does not explicitly indicate claimed Unix based operating system.

Gartland discloses claimed Unix based operating system (see para. 0050, Gartland).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because claimed Unix based operating system of Gartland's teaching would have allowed WILKERSON's system for overall ISR system to arrange automatically handle a plurality of different reported error conditions and other issues that are recognized as having possible automatic resolutions or recoveries as suggested by see para 00021, Gartland.

As to claim 6,

WILKERSON teaches wherein said operating system comprises a Windows-based operating system (see col. 11, lines 34-41, Wilkerson).

WILKERSON does not explicitly indicate claimed linux based operating system.

Gartland discloses claimed Windows based operating system (see para. 0050, Gartland).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because claimed Windows based operating system of Gartland's teaching would have allowed WILKERSON's system for overall ISR system to arrange automatically handle a plurality of different reported error conditions and other issues that are recognized as having possible automatic resolutions or recoveries as suggested by see para 00021, Gartland.

Claim 15 have the same subject matter as of claims 4-6 and essentially rejected for the same reasons as discussed above.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-4105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 am-6:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Mohammad Ali
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2166

MA
December 8, 2006